arXiv:0912.2864v1 [math.PR] 15 Dec 2009

MARTINGALE APPROXIMATION AND OPTIMALITY OF SOME CONDITIONS FOR THE CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM

Dalibor Volný

Université de Rouen

Abstract. Let (X_i) be a stationary and ergodic Markov chain with kernel Q, f an L^2 function on its state space. If Q is a normal operator and $f = (I-Q)^{1/2}g$ (which is equivalent to the convergence of $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k f}{n^{3/2}}$ in L^2), we have the central limit theorem (cf. [D-L 1], [G-L 2]). Without assuming normality of Q, the CLT is implied by the convergence of $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k f\|_2}{n^{3/2}}$, in particular by $\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k f\|_2 = o(\sqrt{n}/\log^q n)$, $q>1$ by [M-Wu] and [Wu-Wo] respectively. We shall show that if Q is not normal and $f \in (I-Q)^{1/2}L^2$, or if the conditions of Maxwell and Woodroofe or of Wu and Woodroofe are weakened to $\sum_{n=1}^\infty c_n \frac{\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k f\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty$ for some sequence $c_n \searrow 0$, or by $\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k f\|_2 = O(\sqrt{n}/\log n)$, the CLT need not hold.

1. Introduction. Let $(S, \mathcal{B}, \nu)$ be a probability space, (ξ_i) a homogeneous and ergodic Markov chain with state space S, transition operator Q, and stationary distribution ν. For a measurable function g on S, $(g(\xi_i))$ is then a stationary random process; we shall study the central limit theorem for

$$S_n(g) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g(\xi_i)$$

where $g \in L_0^2(\nu)$, i.e. is square integrable and has zero mean. Gordin and Lifšic ([G-L 1]) showed that if g is a solution of the equation

$$g = (I-Q)h = h - Qh$$

with $h \in L^2(\nu)$ then a *martingale approximation* giving the CLT exists. More precisely, there exists a martingale difference sequence of $m(\xi_i) = h(\xi_i) - Qh(\xi_{i+1})$ such that $\|S_n(g-m)\|_2/\sqrt{n} \to 0$ (as shown in [Vo 1], this condition is equivalent to Gordin's condition from [G]). The result was extended to normal operators Q and functions g satisfying

$$g = (I-Q)^{1/2}h \tag{1}$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G10, 60G42, 28D05, 60F05.

Key words and phrases. martingale aproximation, martingale difference sequence, strictly stationary process, Markov chain, central limit theorem.

with $h \in L^2$. The operator $(I-Q)^{1/2}$ is defined using the series of the function $\sqrt{1-x}$, $x \in [-1,1]$ (cf. [D-L 1]). For reversible operators Q the result was proved by Kipnis and Varadhan in 1986 ([K-V]), for normal operators Q the result appears in 1981 in [G-L 2] with a proof published later in [G-L 3], in 1996 the result was independently proved by Derriennic and Lin in [D-L 1]. Derriennic and Lin formulated the condition (1) in its present form; the other authors used spectral forms of the condition. As noticed by Gordin and Holzmann ([G-Ho]), (1) is equivalent to the convergence of

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k g}{n^{3/2}} \quad \text{in} \quad L^2. \tag{2}$$

They did not present a proof of this statement; for making reader's homework given in [G-Ho] easier, let us give several arguments.

By [D-L 1] we have that $f \in \sqrt{I-Q}L^2$ iff $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(j+1)a_{j+1}Q^j f$ converges, where $a_j = -\binom{j-3/2}{j}$; by the Stirling formula, $a_j \sim \frac{j^{-3/2}}{2\sqrt{\pi}}$ with a summable error term.

From the convergence of $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} Q^k f$ and Kronecker's lemma it follows $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{k=1}^{n} Q^k f \to 0$.
By double summation and elementary estimation we can find that the series (2) converges iff the sequence of $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\Big) Q^k f$ converges. We thus have that $f \in \sqrt{I-Q}L^2$ implies the convergence in (2).

The proof of the converse copies the proof of (a more general) Lemma 4.1 in [Cu 2].

Suppose that the series (2) converges. Denote $S_k(g) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} Q^j g$. We have

$$\sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \frac{S_k(g)}{k^{3/2}} = S_n(g) \sum_{k=n}^{2n-1} \frac{1}{k^{3/2}} + Q^n \Big(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_k(g)}{(n+k)^{3/2}} \Big) \to 0.$$

Because the sequence of partial sums of the series (2) is Cauchy and Q is a Markov operator, $\big\| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_k(g)}{(n+k)^{3/2}} \big\|_2 \to 0$ will imply that $\frac{S_n(g)}{n^{3/2}}$ converges to 0. Let us prove it.

Define $R_n = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{S_k(g)}{k^{3/2}}$. We have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_k(g)}{(n+k)^{3/2}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (R_k - R_{k+1}) \frac{k^{3/2}}{(n+k)^{3/2}} =$$

$$= \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} R_k \Big(\frac{k^{3/2}}{(n+k)^{3/2}} - \frac{(k-1)^{3/2}}{(n+k-1)^{3/2}} \Big) + \frac{R_1}{(n+1)^{3/2}} - \frac{R_n (n-1)^{3/2}}{(2n-1)^{3/2}}.$$

By (2), $\|R_n\|_2 \to 0$ hence given an $\epsilon > 0$ there exists an n_0 such that $\|R_n\|_2 < \epsilon$ for $n \geq n_0$. We thus have

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} R_k \Big(\frac{k^{3/2}}{(n+k)^{3/2}} - \frac{(k-1)^{3/2}}{(n+k-1)^{3/2}} \Big) \Big\|_2 \leq$$

$$\leq \max_{2 \leq k \leq n_0} \|R_k\|_2 \sum_{k=2}^{n_0} \Big(\frac{k^{3/2}}{(n+k)^{3/2}} - \frac{(k-1)^{3/2}}{(n+k-1)^{3/2}} \Big) + \epsilon,$$

therefore $\| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{S_k(g)}{(n+k)^{3/2}} \|_2 \to 0$, hence $\frac{S_n(g)}{n^{3/2}}$. The convergence of the series (2) is equivalent to the convergence of $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) Q^k g$, we thus get that $\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} Q^k g$ converges, which is equivalent to $g \in \sqrt{I-Q}L^2$.

As we shall see in Theorem 1, without normality of Q the condition (2) does not imply the CLT. Maxwell and Woodroofe have shown in [M-Wo] that if

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\| \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k g \|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty \tag{3}$$

then (without any other assumptions on the Markov operator Q) the martingale approximation (and the CLT) takes place.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu)$ be a probability space with a bijective, bimeasurable and measure preserving transformation T. For a measurable function f on Ω, $(f \circ T^i)_i$ is a (strictly) stationary process and reciprocally, using the first cannonical process, we get that any (strictly) stationary process can be represented in this way: to a stationary process $(X_i)_i$ defined on a probability space $(\Omega', \mathcal{A}', P)$ we define a mapping ψ: $\Omega' \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by $\psi(\omega) = (X_i(\omega))_i$, and on $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ equipped with the product σ-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ we define the image measure $\mu = P \circ \psi^{-1}$. By T we denote the left shift transformation of Ω onto itself, $(T\omega)_i = \omega_{i-1}$. If Z_i is the projection of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ to the i-th coordinate then the distribution of the process (Z_i) is the same as the distribution of (X_i) and $Z_i = Z_0 \circ T^i$.

Any stationary process can be represented by a homogeneous and stationary Markov chain ([Wu-Wo], a similar idea appears already in [R, p.65]). To a process (X_i) we associate a Markov chain (ξ_k) with $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ for the state space, where $\xi_k = (\dots, X_{k-1}, X_k)$, the transition operator Q is given by $Q(x, B) = \mu(\xi_1 \in B | \xi_0 = x) = \mu(\xi_1 \in B | X_0 = x_0, X_{-1} = x_{-1}, \dots)$ where $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, and a stationary distribution is given by the distribution of the process $(X_i)_{i \le 0}$. For $g(x) = x_0$, $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the process $g(\xi_i)$ has the same distribution as (X_i).

For g integrable we have $Qg(\xi_i) = E(g(\xi_{i+1}) | \xi_i)$. The conditions (2) and (3) thus can be expressed in the following way.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ be a dynamical system (a probability space with a bimeasurable and measure preserving bijective transformation $T : \Omega \to \Omega$), $\mathcal{F}_i$ an increasing filtration with $T^{-1}\mathcal{F}_i = \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$, f is a square integrable and zero mean function on Ω, $\mathcal{F}_0$-measurable. We denote

$$S_n(f) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f \circ T^i.$$

The convergence in (2) is then equivalent to the convergence (in L^2) of

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)}{n^{3/2}} \tag{2'}$$

and (3) becomes

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty. \tag{3'}$$

Remark 1. Notice that in (2') and (3'), the natural filtration need not be used, it is sufficient to suppose that the process $(f \circ T^i)$ is adapted to $(\mathcal{F}_i)$. The natural filtration is the smallest filtration with respect to which the process $(f \circ T^i)$ is adapted, hence the convergence in (2'), (3') for $(\mathcal{F}_i)$ implies the convergence for the natural filtration.

Remark 2. In this article we suppose that the dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ is ergodic, i.e. for all sets $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $A = T^{-1}A$, it is $\mu(A) = 0$ or $\mu(A) = 1$. A stationary (here, this always means strictly stationary) process (X_i) is said to be ergodic if there exists an ergodic dynamical system with a process $(f \circ T^i)_i$ equally distributed as (X_i). Remark that an ergodic process can be represented within a non ergodic dynamical system.

Let $X_i = f \circ T^i$. Then the mapping ψ: $\Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ defined by $\psi(\omega) = (X_i(\omega))_i$ is a factor map of Ω onto $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$, hence if $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ is ergodic then the dynamical system defined by the first cannonical process is ergodic (cf. [C-F-S]). The process (X_i) is thus ergodic if and only if the associated dynamical system defined by the first cannonical process is ergodic.

Remark 3. Let $(f \circ T^i)$ be the first cannonical process representation for a stationary process (X_i) and let $(g(\xi_i))$ be the Markov chain representation of $(f \circ T^i)_i$ (f is thus the projection to the zero-th coordinate of $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ and T is the left shift). Ergodicity of the Markov chain (ξ_i) is equivalent to ergodicity of (X_i):
We define $S = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$, $\mathcal{B}$ is the product σ-algebra on $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$. Let us define ϕ: $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to (\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}})^{\mathbb{Z}} = S^{\mathbb{Z}}$ by $\phi((\omega_k)_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}) = ((\omega_i)_{i\le k})_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$, $\nu = \mu \circ \phi^{-1}$. The measure $\nu = \mu \circ \phi^{-1}$ is invariant with respect to the left shift τ on $S^{\mathbb{Z}}$, ϕ is a bimeasurable bijection of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}$ onto $\phi(\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}) \in \mathcal{B}$ which commutes with the transformations T, τ: $\phi \circ T = \tau \circ \phi$. The dynamical systems $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ and $(S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{B}, \nu, \tau)$ are thus isomorphic.
If ξ_i: $S^{\mathbb{Z}} \to S$ are the coordinate projections, (ξ_i) is a Markov chain and for g: $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$, $g(x) = x_0$, $x = (\dots, x_{-1}, x_0)$, $(g(\xi_i))$ has the same distribution as $(f \circ T^i)$. Because ergodicity is invariant with respect to isomorphism ([CFS]) and the dynamical system $(S^{\mathbb{Z}}, \mathcal{B}, \nu, \tau)$ is the first cannonical process for (ξ_i), ergodicity of the Markov chain (ξ_i) is equivalent to ergodicity of (X_i).

Remark 4. In [Vo 2] a nonadapted version of the Maxwell-Woodroofe aproximation (3') have been found.

In the present paper we will deal with optimality of the conditions (2') and (3'), hence also of (2) and (3).

Theorem 1. *There exists an ergodic process $(f \circ T^i)$ such that the series*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)}{n^{3/2}} \tag{2'}$$

converges in L^2, but for two different subsequences (n'_k), (n''_k), the distributions of $S_{n'_k}/\sigma_{n'_k}$ and $S_{n''_k}/\sigma_{n''_k}$ converge to different limits.

Therefore, if (ξ_i) is a homogeneous ergodic Markov chain (ξ_i) with a transition operator Q, then without normality of Q, the condition $g \in (I-Q)^{1/2}L^2$ is not sufficient for the CLT.

In the next two theorems we show that in the central limit theorem of Maxwell and Woodroofe, the rate of convergence of $\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2$ towards 0 is practically optimal. We denote $\sigma_n = \|ES_n(f)\|_2$.

Theorem 2. *For any sequence of positive reals* $c_n \to 0$ *there exists an ergodic process* $(f \circ T^i)$ *such that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \frac{\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty \tag{4}$$

but for two different subsequences (n'_k), (n''_k), *the distributions of* $S_{n'_k}/\sigma_{n'_k}$ *and* $S_{n''_k}/\sigma_{n''_k}$ *converge to different limits.*

Theorem 3. *There exists an ergodic process* $(f \circ T^i)$ *such that*

$$\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = o\Big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\Big), \tag{5}$$

but for two different subsequences (n'_k), (n''_k), *the distributions of* $S_{n'_k}/\sigma_{n'_k}$ *and* $S_{n''_k}/\sigma_{n''_k}$ *converge to different limits.*

Remark 5. In [Pe-U], under the assumption (4) Peligrad and Utev have shown that there exists an f such the sequence of $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$ is not stochastically bounded.

Remark 6. In [Wu-Wo] M. Woodroofe and W.B. Wu showed that if $\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = o(\sigma_n)$ then $\sigma_n = h(n)\sqrt{n}$ where $h(n)$ is a slowly varying function in the sense of Karamata and there exists an array $D_{n,i}$ of martingale differences such that for each n, the sequence $(D_{n,i})_i$ is a strictly stationary martingale difference sequence and $\|S_n(f) - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} D_{n,i}\|_2 = o(\sigma_n)$. In particular, under the condition (4) this approximation still takes place.

In the same paper [Wu-Wo], Wu and Woodroofe used the condition

$$\|E(S_n(f) \,|\, \mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = o\Big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log^q n}\Big) \tag{6}$$

where $q > 1$. (6) implies (3') hence a martingale approximation and the CLT. Theorem 3 shows that the result cannot be extended to $q = 1$.

Remark 7. The condition (5) which can be written as $\|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k g\|_2 = o\big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\big)$ implies that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\|\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Q^k g\|_2^2}{n^2} < \infty$. By [Cu 1], Proposition 2.2, for a normal operator Q this implies $g \in \sqrt{I-Q}L^2$ hence a CLT; Theorem 3 shows that the assumption of normality cannot be lifted.

Remark 8. From the construction it follows that in Theorems 1-3, the variances σ_n^2 of $S_n(f)$ grow faster than linearly. It thus remains an open problem whether with a supplementary assumption $\sigma_n^2/n \to const.$ the CLT would hold. As shown by a counter example in [Kl-Vo2], this assumption is not sufficient for $q \le 1/2$ (in [Kl-Vo2], a function f is found such that (6) holds with $q = 1/2$, $\sigma_n^2/n \to const.$, but the distributions of $S_n(f)/\sqrt{n}$ do not converge); the only exponents to consider are thus $1/2 < q \le 1$.

It also remains an open question whether the CLT would hold for $f \in L^{2+\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$.

2. Proofs.

We first define an ergodic dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ where the processes $(f \circ T^i)$ which we need can be found.

For $l = 1, 2, \dots$ we define $A_l = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ if l is odd and $A_l = \mathbb{R}$ if l is even, the sets A_l are equipped with Borel σ-algebras and probability measures ν_l such that $\nu_l(\{-1\}) = 1/(2N_l) = \nu_l(\{1\})$ and $\nu_l(\{0\}) = 1 - 1/N_l$ for l odd, $\nu_l = \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ for l even. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we define $\Omega_i = \mathop{\times}\limits_{l=1}^{\infty} A_l$; Ω_i is equipped with the product measure $\mu_i = \bigotimes\limits_{l=1}^{\infty} \nu_l$. On the set $\Omega = \mathop{\times}\limits_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \Omega_i$, μ is the product measure $\mu = \bigotimes\limits_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \mu_i$ and T is the left shift transformation. By definition, the dynamical system $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mu, T)$ is Bernoulli hence ergodic. By $\mathcal{F}_k$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote the σ-algebra generated by projections of Ω onto Ω_l, $l \le k$.

In all of the text, log will denote the dyadic logarithm. By U we denote the unitary operator on L^2 defined by $Uf = f \circ T$. P_i denotes the orthogonal projection on the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathcal{F}_i) \ominus L^2(\mathcal{F}_{i-1})$, i.e.

$$P_i f = E(f|\mathcal{F}_i) - E(f|\mathcal{F}_{i-1}),$$

$f \in L^2$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For $k = 1, 2, \dots$ let $n_k = 2^k$,

$$0 \le a_k \le 1, \quad a_k/a_{k+1} \to 1, \quad a_{k+1} \le a_k, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k/k = \infty;$$

(N_l), $l = 1, 2, \dots$, is an increasing sequence of positive integers such that

$$2^{2^l} - 1 < \sum_{k\ge 1: N_{l-1} < n_k \le N_l} \frac{a_k}{k} < 2^{2^l} + 1.$$

Denote by π_0 the projection of Ω onto Ω_0 and by p_l the projection of Ω_0 onto A_l. For $N_{l-1} < n_k \le N_l$ we then define $e_k = \frac{a_k}{k} p_l \circ \pi_0$. Then

$$\|e_k\|_2 = a_k/k,$$

and for $i \ne j$, $U^i e_k$ and $U^j e_l$ are independent. Notice that for $N_{l-1} < n_k \le N_l$ the random variables e_k are multiples one of another and are independent of any e_j with $n_j \le N_{l-1}$ or $n_j > N_l$. In general, $e_{k'}$, $e_{k''}$ are not orthogonal but for all $1 \le k', k''$ it is $E(e_{k'} e_{k''}) \ge 0$ and

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{n} e_k \Big\|_2 \nearrow \infty \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty;$$

for $b'_k \ge b_k \ge 0$ we thus have

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{n} b'_k e_k \Big\|_2 \ge \Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{n} b_k e_k \Big\|_2. \tag{7}$$

Let

$$f = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k - 1} U^{-i} e_k.$$

We have $\|f\|_2 \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \|e_k\|_2/\sqrt{n_k} < \infty$ due to the exponential growth of the n_ks.

For a positive integer N we have

$$S_N(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} \frac{1}{n_k} U^{j-i} e_k = S'_N(f) + S''_N(f)$$

where

$$S'_N(f) = S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{(j\wedge n_k)-1} \frac{1}{n_k} U^{j-i} e_k$$

$(j \wedge n_k = \min\{j, n_k\})$ and

$$S''_N(f) = E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=j}^{n_k-1} \frac{1}{n_k} U^{j-i} e_k.$$

We will study the asymptotic behaviour of $S''_N(f) = E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ and $S'_N(f) = S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ separately. In Lemmas 1-5 we find estimates for $E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$ and an approximation of $S'_N(f)$ by sums of martingale differences. These lemmas do not depend on distributions of the random variables e_k. Then we use the distributions of the random variables e_k to get a limit behaviour of the distributions of $S_n(f)/\sigma_n$ which we need.

1. Asymptotics of $S''_N(f) = E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$.

Lemma 1. *The series*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)}{n^{3/2}} \tag{2'}$$

converges in L^2.

Proof. For $N \le n_k$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=j}^{n_k-1} U^{j-i} e_k = \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-N} N U^{-i} e_k + \sum_{i=n_k-N+1}^{n_k-1} (n_k - i) U^{-i} e_k$$

and for $N > n_k$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=j}^{n_k-1} U^{j-i} e_k = \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-1} (n_k - j) U^{-j} e_k,$$

hence

$$S''_N(f) = \sum_{k\ge 1: n_k < N} \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-1} \frac{n_k - j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k + \tag{8}$$

$$+ \sum_{k\ge 1: n_k \ge N} \Big[\sum_{j=0}^{n_k-N} \frac{N}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k + \sum_{j=n_k-N+1}^{n_k-1} \frac{n_k - j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k \Big].$$

To prove the lemma it is thus sufficient to show that the sums

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k<N} \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-1} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \frac{n_k-j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k, \tag{8a}$$

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k\geq N} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-N} \frac{N}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k, \tag{8b}$$

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k\geq N} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \sum_{j=n_k-N+1}^{n_k-1} \frac{n_k-j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k \tag{8c}$$

converge in L^2.

Recall that $n_k = 2^k$. We show that the sequence of partial sums for the first series is Cauchy. Let $1 \leq p < q < \infty$.

$$\Big\| \sum_{N=p}^{q} \sum_{k\geq 1: 2^k<N} \sum_{j=0}^{2^k-1} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \frac{2^k-j}{2^k} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2 =$$

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big(\sum_{N=(2^k+1)\vee p}^{q} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}} \Big) \sum_{j=0}^{2^k-1} \frac{2^k-j}{2^k} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2 =$$

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_k(p,q) \sum_{j=0}^{2^k-1} \frac{2^k-j}{2^{3k/2}} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2 = \Big\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} b_k(p,q) \frac{2^k-j}{2^{3k/2}} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2$$

where $b_k(p,q) = 2^{k/2} \sum_{N=(2^k+1)\vee p}^{q} \frac{1}{N^{3/2}}$. Notice that $b_k(p,q)$ are uniformly bounded and for each k, $\sup_{q\geq p} b_k(p,q) \searrow 0$ as $p \to \infty$. Denote $B = \sup_{k,p,q} b_k(p,q) < \infty$. Using $\|e_k\|_2 \leq 1/k$ we deduce

$$\Big\| \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} b_k(p,q) \frac{2^k-j}{2^{3k/2}} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2 \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Big\| \sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} \frac{b_k(p,q)}{2^{k/2}} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2^2 \leq$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} \frac{b_k(p,q)}{k 2^{k/2}} \Big)^2$$

where

$$\sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} \frac{b_k(p,q)}{k 2^{k/2}} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}-1} \frac{B}{\sqrt{(j+1)}[1\vee \log(j+1)]},$$

hence

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1\vee \log(j+1)} \frac{b_k(p,q)}{k 2^{k/2}} \Big)^2 < \infty,$$

therefore

$$\Big\|\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k\geq 1\vee\log(j+1)} b_k(p,q)\frac{2^k-j}{2^{3k/2}}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2\leq$$

$$\leq \lim_{p\to\infty}\sup_{q\geq p}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\Big(\sum_{k\geq 1\vee\log(j+1)}\frac{b_k(p,q)}{k2^{k/2}}\Big)^2=0.$$

For the second sum we define

$$b_k(p,q)=\frac{1}{2^{k/2}}\sum_{N=p}^{2^k\wedge q}\frac{1}{N^{1/2}}$$

and get

$$\Big\|\sum_{N=p}^{q}\sum_{k\geq 1:2^k\geq N}\frac{1}{N^{3/2}}\sum_{j=0}^{2^k-N}\frac{N}{2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2=\Big\|\sum_{N=p}^{q}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k\geq\log(N+j)}\frac{1}{N^{1/2}2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2=$$

$$=\Big\|\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\sum_{k\geq\log(j+1)}\Big(\sum_{N=p}^{q\wedge(2^k-j)}\frac{1}{N^{1/2}}\Big)\frac{1}{2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2\leq$$

$$\leq\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\Big\|\sum_{k\geq\log(j+1)}\frac{b_k(p,q)}{2^{k/2}}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2\to 0$$

as $p\to\infty$ using similar arguments as in the preceding case.

For the third sum we get

$$\Big\|\sum_{N=p}^{q}\sum_{k\geq 1:2^k\geq N}\frac{1}{N^{3/2}}\sum_{j=2^k-N+1}^{2^k-1}\frac{2^k-j}{2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2=$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\Big\|\sum_{k\geq\log(j+1)}\sum_{N=p\vee(2^k-j+1)}^{q\wedge 2^k}\frac{1}{N^{3/2}}\frac{2^k-j}{2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2\leq$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\Big\|\sum_{k\geq\log(j+1)}\Big(\sum_{N=p\vee(2^k-j+1)}^{q\wedge 2^k}\frac{1}{N^{1/2}}\Big)\frac{1}{2^k}U^{-j}e_k\Big\|_2^2\to 0$$

as $p\to\infty$. The sequences of partial sums for (8a), (8b), (8c) are Cauchy hence converge in L^2. Therefore, the series $\sum_{N=1}^{\infty}\frac{E(S_N(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)}{N^{3/2}}$ converges in L^2.

$\square$

Lemma 2. *There exists a constant* $0<c<\infty$ *such that*

$$\|E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2^2\leq c\frac{Na_{[\log N]}^2}{\log^2 N}\tag{9}$$

for all $N\geq 2$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(1/\sqrt{6})\|e_k\|_2\sqrt{n_k} \le \Big\| \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-1} \frac{n_k - j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2 \le \|e_k\|_2\sqrt{n_k}, \quad n_k < N, \\
&\Big\| \sum_{j=0}^{n_k-N} \frac{N}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k + \sum_{j=n_k-N+1}^{n_k-1} \frac{n_k - j}{n_k} U^{-j} e_k \Big\|_2 \le \frac{N}{\sqrt{n_k}}\|e_k\|_2, \quad n_k \ge N.
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Recall that by $[x]$ we denote the integer part of x. Because $n_k = 2^k$ grows exponentially fast, the norms $\|e_k\|_2$ are decreasing, and $\|e_k\|_2/\|e_{k+1}\|_2 \to 1$, there exists a constant $0 < c < \infty$ not depending on N such that

$$\sum_{k\ge 1: n_k \ge N} (N/\sqrt{n_k})\|e_k\|_2 \le c\sqrt{N}\|e_{[\log N]}\|_2,$$

$$\sum_{k\ge 1: n_k < N} \|e_k\|_2\sqrt{n_k} \le c\sqrt{N}\|e_{[\log N]}\|_2.$$

Using (8) and (10) we deduce that for some constant $c > 0$ we have

$$\|E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2^2 \le cN\|e_{[\log N]}\|_2^2.$$

Because $\|e_k\|_2 = a_k/k$,

$$\|E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2^2 \le c\frac{N a_{[\log N]}^2}{\log^2 N}.$$

□

Recall

$$\|e_k\|_2 = a_k/k, \quad 0 \le a_k \le 1, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k/k = \infty.$$

As a coroallary to Lemma 2 we get

Lemma 3.

$$\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = O\Big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\Big),$$

if $a_n \to 0$ *then*

$$\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = o\Big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\Big).$$

Lemma 4. *Let* c_n *be positive real numbers,* $c_n \searrow 0$. *If*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n c_n}{n} < \infty \quad \textit{then} \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \frac{\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} < \infty.$$

Proof. Recall Lemma 2 and $a_{k+1} \le a_k$, denote the constant in (9) by C. We have

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} c_n \frac{\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2}{n^{3/2}} \le C\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} c_n \frac{a_{[\log n]+1}}{n[\log n]} \le C\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\sum_{i=0}^{2^k-1} c_{2^k+i}\frac{a_k}{k(2^k+i)} \le$$

$$\le C\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_{2^k}\frac{a_k}{k} \le C\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k\frac{a_k}{k} < \infty.$$

□

2. Asymptotics of $S'_N(f) = S_N(f) - E(S_N(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)$.

Denote $b(N) = \|\sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq N} e_k\|_2 = \|\sum_{k=1}^{[\log N]} e_k\|_2$; notice that by the assumptions on e_k, $b(N) \nearrow \infty$.

Lemma 5. *We have*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}} \Big\| S'_N(f) - \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq N} e_k \Big\|_2 = 0. \tag{11}$$

Proof. Recall that

$$S'_N(f) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{(j\wedge n_k)-1} \frac{1}{n_k} U^{j-i} e_k.$$

For $N \leq n_k$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{(j\wedge n_k)-1} U^{j-i} e_k = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} (N-j) U^j e_k \tag{12}$$

and for $N > n_k$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{(j\wedge n_k)-1} U^{j-i} e_k = \sum_{j=1}^{N-n_k} n_k U^j e_k + \sum_{j=N-n_k+1}^{N-1} (N-j) U^j e_k. \tag{13}$$

For all $k \geq 1$ we have $P_l U^j e_k = 0$ if $j \neq l$, $P_l U^l e_k = U^l e_k$. For $l \geq N$ and $l \leq 0$ we thus have $P_l S_N(f) = 0$ and for $1 \leq l \leq N-1$ we, using (12) and (13), deduce

$$P_l S_N(f) = \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq N-l} U^l e_k + \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \geq N+1-l} \frac{N-l}{n_k} U^l e_k. \tag{14}$$

Recall that $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x. We have

$$S'_N(f) = \sum_{l=1}^{N-1} P_l S_N(f) = \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} P_l S_N(f) + \sum_{l=[N(1-\epsilon)]+1}^{N} P_l S_N(f)$$

and using (14) we get

$$\sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} P_l S_N(f) =$$

$$\sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq N-l} e_k + \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \geq N+1-l} \frac{N-l}{n_k} e_k =$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq \epsilon N} e_k + \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: \epsilon N < n_k \leq N-l} e_k +$$

$$+ \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \geq N+1-l} \frac{N-l}{n_k} e_k.$$

Because $n_k = 2^k$,

$$\Big\| \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \geq N+1-l} \frac{N-l}{n_k} U^l e_k \Big\|_2 \leq 2\|e_{[\log(N-l)]}\|_2 \leq 2/\log(N-l), \tag{15}$$

hence

$$\Big\| \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \geq N+1-l} \frac{N-l}{n_k} e_k \Big\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\log N + \log \epsilon}$$

(we can suppose N big enough to have $\log N > |\log \epsilon|$); $\epsilon N < n_k \leq N$ if and only if $\log N + \log \epsilon < k \leq \log N$. We thus deduce that for $\epsilon > 0$ fixed and $b(N) = \| \sum_{k=1}^{\log N} e_k \|_2 \nearrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{b(N)} \Big\| \sum_{\epsilon N < n_k \leq N} e_k \Big\|_2 = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}} \Big\| \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} P_l S_N(f) - \sum_{l=1}^{[N(1-\epsilon)]} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq \epsilon N} e_k \Big\|_2 = 0.$$

For all $[N(1-\epsilon)] + 1 \leq l \leq N-1$ we have, by (14) and (15), $\|P_l S_N(f)\|_2 \leq b(N-l) + 2/\log(N-l)$ hence

$$\lim_{\epsilon\searrow 0} \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}} \Big\| \sum_{l=[N(1-\epsilon)]+1}^{N-1} P_l S_N(f) - \sum_{l=[N(1-\epsilon)]+1}^{N-1} \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k \leq \epsilon N} U^l e_k \Big\|_2 = 0$$

and (11) follows.

□

Recall that

$$\|e_k\|_2 = a_k/k, \quad 0 \leq a_k \leq 1, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k/k = \infty$$

N_l, $l = 1, 2, \ldots$, is an increasing sequence of positive integers such that

$$2^{2^l} - 1 < \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1} < n_k \leq N_l} \frac{a_k}{k} < 2^{2^l} + 1; \tag{16}$$

for $N_{l-1} < n_k \leq N_l$ the random variables e_k are multiples one of another and are independent of any e_j with $n_j \leq N_{l-1}$ or $n_j > N_l$.

Lemma 6. *Along l odd the distributions of*

$$\frac{1}{b(N_l)\sqrt{N_l}} \sum_{j=0}^{N_l - 1} U^j \Big(\sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1} < n_k \leq N_l} e_k \Big)$$

weakly converge to the symmetrised Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda = 1/2$ and for l even to the standard normal distribution.

Proof. From the definition of the functions e_k it follows that $b^2(N_l) = b^2(N_{l-1}) + \| \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k\|_2^2$ and $\| \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k\|_2 = \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} a_k/k \sim 2^{2^l}$ hence $\| \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k\|_2 \sim b(N_l)$.

For l odd, the random variable $\sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k$ takes values $\approx \pm b(N_l)\sqrt{N_l}$ with probabilities $1/(2N_l)$ and 0 with probability $1-1/N_l$.

For l even, $\sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k$ is normally distributed with zero mean and variance $\approx b^2(N_l)$.

By the assumptions, $U^i \sum_{k\geq 1: N_{l-1}<n_k\leq N_l} e_k$ are independent random variables and the statement of the lemma follows.

□

Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3. By Lemma 1 the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{E(S_n(f)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_0)}{n^{3/2}}$ converges in L^2. We can have $a_n \searrow 0$, e.g. $a_n = 1/\log n$ for $n \geq 2$; by Lemma 3 then $\|E(S_n(f)|\mathcal{F}_0)\|_2 = o\Big(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\log n}\Big)$. From Lemma 3 and Lemma 5 it follows

$$\Big\|E(S_n(f) - \sum_{l=0}^{N-1} U^l \sum_{k\geq 1: n_k\leq N} e_k\Big\|_2 = o\Big(\frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}}\Big),$$

using Lemma 6 we thus get that along l odd the distributions of $\frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}} S_n(f)$ weakly converge to the symmetrised Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda = 1/2$ and for l even to the standard normal law.

□

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $c_k > 0$; without loss of generality we can suppose $c_k \searrow 0$. We define $k_0 = 1$ and for $n = 1, 2, \dots$ let k_n be the first k such that $c_k \leq 1/2^n$ and $k_n - k_{n-1} \geq n$; $a_{k_0} = 1$ and for $n \geq 1$, a_{k_n} is the minimum of $a_{k_{n-1}}$ and $(\sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{j})^{-1}$. For $k_{n-1}+1 \leq j \leq k_n - 1$ we define

$$a_j = a_{k_{n-1}} + \alpha_j (a_{k_n} - a_{k_{n-1}}), \quad \alpha_j = \begin{cases} \frac{j-k_{n-1}}{n} & \text{if } \ 1 \leq j - k_{n-1} \leq n \\ 1 \ \text{ if } \ n+1 \leq j - k_{n-1} \leq k_n - k_{n-1} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n c_n}{n} < \infty, \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} = \infty.$$

To verify the first inequality we notice that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n c_n}{n} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \Big[a_{k_n} \sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{j} + (a_{k_{n-1}} - a_{k_n}) \sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{n} \frac{1-\alpha_j}{j}\Big].$$

By definition, $a_{k_n} \sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{j} \leq 1$, and by boundedness of a_n we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n a_{k_{n-1}}}{2^n} < \infty$.

To verify the second inequality we notice

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} \geq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{k_n} \sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{j}.$$

If $a_{k_n} = (\sum_{j=k_{n-1}+1}^{k_n} \frac{1}{j})^{-1}$ for infinitely many n then the sum is infinite. Otherwise, from some n_0 on, the sequence a_n is constant and strictly positive; the series is infinite as well.

A simple calculation shows that the sequence of a_n is decreasing, $0 \le a_n \le 1$, and $a_n/a_{n+1} \to 1$.

The inequality $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n c_n}{n} < \infty$ makes the assumptions of Theorem 2 satisfied and the equality $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n} = \infty$, together with Lemma 6, implies that f can be defined so that along l odd the distributions of $\frac{1}{b(N)\sqrt{N}} S_n(f)$ weakly converge to the symmetrised Poisson distribution with parameter $\lambda = 2$ and for l even to the standard normal law.

$\square$

Acknowledgement. The author thanks the referee for having pointed out several mistakes in preceding versions of the article and for many helpful comments and remarks. I thank Dr. Christophe Cuny for having let me use a proof from his (yet) unpublished paper [Cu 2].

References

[B] Billingsley, P., *The Lindeberg-Lévy theorem for martingales*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (1961), 788-792.

[C-F-S] Cornfeld, I.P., Fomin, S.V., and Sinai, Ya.G., *Ergodic Theory*, Springer, Berlin, 1982.

[Cu 1] Cuny, Ch., *Pointwise ergodic theorems with rate and application to limit theorems for stationary processes*, sumitted for publication, arXiv:0904.0185 (2009).

[Cu 2] Cuny, Ch., *Norm convergence of some power-series of operators in L^p with applications in ergodic theory*, sumitted for publication (2009).

[D-L 1] Derriennic, Y. and Lin, M., *Sur le théorème limite central de Kipnis et Varadhan pour les chaînes réversibles ou normales*, CRAS 323 (1996), 1053-1057.

[D-L 2] Derriennic, Y and Lin, M., *The central limit theorem for Markov chains with normal transition operators, started at a point*, Probab. Theory Relat. Fields **119** (2001), 509-528.

[G] Gordin, M.I., *A central limit theorem for stationary processes*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **10** (1969), 1174-1176.

[G-Ho] Gordin, M.I. and Holzmann, H., *The central limit theorem for stationary Markov chains under invariant splittings*, Stochastics and Dynamics **4** (2004), 15-30.

[G-L 1] Gordin, M.I. and Lifšic, B.A., *Central limit theorem for statioanry processes*, Soviet Math. Doklady 19 (1978), 392-394.

[G-L 2] Gordin, M.I. and Lifšic, B.A., *A remark about a Markov process with normal transition operator*, In: Third Vilnius Conference on Probability and Statistics **1** (1981), 147-148.

[G-L 3] Gordin, M.I. and Lifšic, B.A., *The central limit theorem for Markov processes with normal transition operator, and a strong form of the central limit theorem*, IV.7 and IV.8 in Borodin and Ibragimov, Limit theorems for functionals of random walks, Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 195(1994), English translation AMS (1995).

[Ha-He] Hall, P. and Heyde, C.C., *Martingale Limit Theory and its Application*, Academic Press, New York, 1980.

[I] Ibragimov, I.A., *A central limit theorem for a class of dependent random variables*, Theory Probab. Appl. **8** (1963), 83-89.

[K-V] Kipnis, C. and Varadhan, S.R.S., *Central limit theorem for additive functionals of reversible Markov processes and applications to simple exclusions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **104** (1986), 1-19.

[Kl-Vo 1] Klicnarová, J. and Volný, D., *An invariance principle for non adapted processes*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser 1 **345/5** (2007), 283-287.

[Kl-Vo 2] Klicnarová, J. and Volný, D., *Exactness of a Wu-Woodroofe's approximation with linear growth of variances*, Stoch. Proc. and their Appl. **119** (2009), 2158-2165.

[M-Wo] Maxwell, M. and Woodroofe, M., *Central limit theorems for additive functionals of Markov chains*, Ann. Probab. **28** (2000), 713-724.

[P-U] Peligrad, M. and Utev, S., *A new maximal inequality and invariance principle for stationary sequences*, Ann. Probab. **33** (2005), 798-815.

[R] Rosenblatt, M., *Markov Processes: Structure and asymptotic behavior*, Springer, Berlin, 1971.

[Vo 1] Volný, D., *Approximating martingales and the central limit theorem for strictly stationary processes*, Stochastic Processes and their Applications **44** (1993), 41-74.

[Vo 2] Volný, D., *Martingale approximation of non adapted stochastic processes with nonlinear growth of variance*, Dependence in Probability and Statistics Series: Lecture Notes in Statistics, Vol. 187 Bertail, Patrice; Doukhan, Paul; Soulier, Philippe (Eds.) (2006).

[Wo] Woodroofe, M., *A central limit theorem for functions of a Markov chain with applications to shifts*, Stoch. Proc. and their Appl. **41** (1992), 31-42.

[Wu-Wo] Wu, W.B. and Woodroofe, M., *Martingale approximation for sums of stationary processes*, Ann. Probab. **32** (2004), 1674-1690.

Département de Mathématiques, Université de Rouen, 76801 Saint Etienne du Rouvray, France
E-mail address: `Dalibor.Volny@univ-rouen.fr`